

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/005,178		SPENCE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Alison K. Pickard		3676	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alison K. Pickard. (3)_____.

(2) Patrick Hilsmier. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 06 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 30-32.

Identification of prior art discussed: all of record.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant submitted proposed amendments to claim 30 (see attached) to overcome the 112 1st rejection and present a broader claim that covers both embodiments (i.e. figures 4 and 7). The proposal would need to be further amended, by removing the limitations in the 3rd paragraph relating to the axis being parallel to the sealing surfaces. This would make the claim generic to both figures and would then be supported by the disclosure for at least Figure 4. As to the claim being allowable, such an amendment would be broader than the other claims (i.e. not limited to axial or radial seals) and would require further search and consideration.